

BC Planning, LLC
555 Route 32, PO Box 489
Highland Mills, New York 10930
(845) 827-5763
Fax: 827-5764
Email: bcocks@frontiernet.net

PROJECT ANALYSIS

MUNICIPALITY: TOWN OF NEWBURGH

TOWN PROJECT NO. 2011-19

PROJECT NAME: JPJR Holdings, LLC Subdivision

LOCATION: Rockwood Drive, North Plank Road and Chestnut Lane (75-1-36.2)

TYPE OF PROJECT: 11 Residential Lot Subdivision (8.8 acres)

DATE: August 14, 2013

REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Approval Status: Submitted September 9, 2011, revised April 23, 2013

SEQRA Status: Unlisted, Planning Board is Lead Agency as of May 2, 2013

Zone/Utilities: R-3/municipal water and sewer

Map Dated: August 8, 2013

Site Inspection: September 9, 2011

Planning Board Agenda: August 15, 2013

Consultant/Applicant: Hudson Land Design Professional Engineering, P.C

Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board Office, James Osborne, Gerald Canfield, Michael Donnelly, Patrick Hines, Karen Arent and Ken Wersted on August 14, 2013

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The bulk table will need to be shown with the actual dimensions of the setbacks with the next submission. The applicant indicated they wanted the lot layout to be approved before adding the dimensions. The setback lines are shown on the lots, which meet all requirements at this time.
2. The buildable area requirement is not shown correctly on the plans. The applicant will need to show a 3,750 square foot rectangle on each lot, with the homes placed inside the rectangle. The building envelope inside the setbacks can be an irregular shape, but the buildable area must be a rectangle.
3. The applicant indicated they will be providing a landscape plan and tree protection plan in a future submission, once the lot layout is approved by the Planning Board.
4. The Planning Board is Lead Agency as of May 2, 2013. The only comment received from outside agencies was the letter from the Orange County Planning Department. The review letter included a binding comment stating the applicant should lose some lots in favor of larger lots that they say meet the community character. The Planning Board can use a majority plus one vote to override this comment. The lots meet all zoning requirements in regards to lot size and shape, including the buildable area requirement (once it is shown properly on the plans) which takes into account environmentally sensitive areas. The comment seems arbitrary when looking at the zoning requirements for the Town.

5. The county also suggested the applicant provide an area for a crosswalk at the intersection of Rockwood Drive and Chestnut Lane. This can be discussed with the Planning Board, as there are no sidewalks along Rockwood Drive at this time.
6. The applicant sent out the adjainer notice in May, as required. If the Planning Board feels as though the plans are ready for a Public Hearing I will draft the notice and send them to the newspapers. The next available date for a hearing would be September 19, 2013.

The above comments represent my professional opinion and judgment, but may not necessarily, in all cases, reflect the opinion of the Planning Board. Please revise your plans to reflect these comments with the understanding that further changes may be required. In all cases the requirements of the Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations shall be adhered to by the applicant and shall be shown on the plans. Where variances to the Zoning Law are required or where waivers from the Subdivision Regulations are needed, specific requests shall be made to the Planning Board for a waiver or for referral to the ZBA. These comments are prepared based on current zoning and subdivision regulation requirements. Any change in those regulations prior to final approval of these plans could require revisions beyond the scope of my existing comments.